

1961

prescribed by law in relation to other land offices of the United States.

Sec. 20. And be it further enacted, That the river in said Territory heretofore known as the River aux Jacques, or James River, shall hereafter be called the Dakota River.

Sec. 21. And be it further enacted, That until Congress shall otherwise direct, that portion of the Territories of Utah and Washington between the 41st and 43d degrees of north latitude, and east of the 33d meridian of longitude west from Washington, shall be, and is hereby, incorporated into and made a part of the Territory of Nebraska.

Approved, March 2, 1861.

[From Public Affairs, Feb. 15, 1961]

#### TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENT

Two territorial conventions (1858-59) met in Sioux Falls prior to the time that Dakota Territory was created for the purpose of establishing the organization of a territorial government and memorializing Congress to recognize the new territory. The organic act to provide a temporary government for the Territory of Dakota became effective on March 2, 1861.

Although several communities sought the honor of being the capital city of the new territory, Yankton, a Missouri River community 60 miles west of Sioux City, Iowa, was selected by the first territorial Governor as the capital city. This community remained as the territorial capital from 1861 to 1883. In the latter year, as a result of political maneuvering, the seat of government was moved to Bismarck, the present State capital of North Dakota. The latter community remained the territorial capital until the division of the territory in 1889.

#### STATEHOOD

Prior to the 1889 convention and constitution, delegates met in two conventions at which the constitutional framework was debated. In 1889 President William Harrison signed the bills which created the twin States of North and South Dakota. The following year the voters designated Pierre as the permanent capital of South Dakota.

The resolution (S. Res. 97) was received and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### SOVIET POLITICAL WARFARE— PRINTING OF ADDRESS BY SENATOR DODD AS A SENATE DOCUMENT

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, on December 1, 1960, there was held in Paris a Conference on Soviet Political Warfare. The junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd] was one of the sponsors of that Conference. He participated in its sessions as a member of the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security. He delivered an address to that Conference entitled "The Confusion of the West." In order that there may be a wider circulation and study of the subject, I submit a resolution and a copy of the Senator's speech to the desk with the request that it be referred to the Committee on Rules for the printing of 1,000 copies as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 99) submitted by Mr. HRUSKA, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the remarks of Senator Thomas J. Dodd at the Conference on Soviet

Political Warfare, Paris, France, on December 1, 1960, be printed as a Senate document, to be entitled "The Confusion of the West: An Analysis of Certain Aspects of Communist Political Warfare."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GRUENING. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I commend the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] for asking that a printing resolution be referred to the Committee on Rules. I hope that the precedent established today will be followed at all times from now on, and that there will be no further requests from the floor for printing analyses, resolutions, and so forth, to be considered on a unanimous-consent basis, because such requests should be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration for consideration.

#### ESTABLISHMENT OF A PERMANENT STANDBY PROGRAM OF EXTENDED UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION BENEFITS— ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on the next printing of S. 5, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] be added as a cosponsor of the bill. It was introduced by the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by the Senator from Pennsylvania appear in the RECORD at this point, in connection with the measure.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### STATEMENT BY SENATOR SCOTT

I am a cosponsor of S. 5, which Senator PROUTY introduced on January 5, 1961. This is a bill which provides for the establishment of a permanent standby program of extended unemployment compensation benefits to be payable during periods of high unemployment.

The experience of the 1958 recession shows that most of those who exhausted the benefits to which they were entitled under State law were steady workers, the chief breadwinners for their families. In New York State where a comprehensive analysis was made, most of the recipients of extended benefits under the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act were found to be steady workers with regular jobs during the preceding 5 years. Aside from their layoff during the 1958 recession, 54 percent had not drawn jobless benefits in any year back to 1953.

A similar situation prevails today. Millions of Americans who want to work cannot find a job and thousands of men with families to support have exhausted their benefit rights under State laws. Both Senator PROUTY and I are deeply concerned about these people. We believe that Congress must act—and act quickly, to alleviate their suffering and hardship.

We are pleased that President Kennedy recognizes that the Federal Government must extend unemployment compensation benefits to those seeking work during this recession. We are disappointed, however, that his proposal is only temporary in character and affords no protection to the

unlucky individual who may find himself in serious economic difficulty during future recessions. I shall have more to say on this point a little later.

The President asked Congress to finance his temporary program by increasing the taxable wage base from \$3,000 to \$4,800. The Ways and Means Committee of the House rejected this request and amended the administration bill so that it now provides for a temporary increase in the present Federal unemployment tax of 3.1 percent for calendar years 1962 and 1963 to 3.5 percent. The committee action is in line with the method of financing called for by S. 5, but the tax jump the House group put in the administration bill is twice as high as the increase provided for in S. 5. Senator PROUTY and I think the Ways and Means Committee has chosen the proper method of financing an extended unemployment compensation benefit program. However, we question seriously the advisability of adding a 0.4 percent tax on all taxable employers at this time.

All things considered, Mr. President, the basic weakness of the administration bill is that it is temporary in character. What is needed now is a bill to establish a permanent standby program of extended unemployment compensation benefits which will give help to jobless workers in this recession and which will aid the unemployed man or woman during future periods of high-level unemployment.

A permanent standby program well considered in advance would be far better than a temporary system such as the administration proposes. Why do I say this?

By the time the T.U.C. law came into play in 1958 half of the jobless people were without unemployment compensation benefits. Now, that is what happened during the 1958 recession. What about the present problem? Secretary of Labor Goldberg has said that we have one-half a million insured unemployed who have no more rights to unemployment compensation under State laws. He also says that we will have at least another hundred thousand people in the same regrettable predicament by April 1.

The policy of trying to take care of critical situations after they arise is not only inhumane, it is bad economics. Economic recovery should be fostered when the first serious slowdown takes place. This would soften the blow and help to flatten out the economic sag.

Only 2 years have elapsed since the most recent recession. Is it realistic to enact a temporary program carrying a high tax increase on the assumption that there will be no other recession in the next 5 to 10 years? It is not realistic—and it is not fair—for Congress to say in effect to the unemployed breadwinner, "We know you have been out of a job for a long time and we know that you have no unemployment compensation money coming in under State law. We are going to see that you get some help and if, in the future, your cupboard gets bare, and you haven't any food for your family, we will think about your problem then. We hope after a few weeks or months we will figure out some solution for it." Mr. President, by perpetuating the practice of handling each recession on a patchwork basis we deny to poor families the barest necessities while the gears of Government get unstuck.

The junior Senator from Vermont, Mr. PROUTY, has long favored the enactment of a permanent program to provide standby benefits to supplement the regular unemployment insurance program. In March of 1958 he introduced H.R. 11634 which called for such a program. The bill was not acted upon by the Ways and Means Committee, but it did influence many States to take action. Shortly after its introduction six States enacted special unemployment benefit

programs which come into operation during the recession period. They were California, Connecticut, Idaho, Illinois, North Carolina and Vermont.

The Republican members of the Senate Special Committee on Unemployment Problems of the previous Congress rejected the notion that new unemployment compensation legislation should be enacted to fight each recession. They endorsed wholeheartedly a permanent standby program that will pay jobless workers benefits when they have exhausted compensation rights under State laws during periods of recession. Senator PROUTY and I were two of the Republican members on that committee. In the final report of the Special Committee on Unemployment Problems the minority had this to say on page 170:

"The minority believes that, in the light of this recent past experience, it is a matter of elementary prudence to deliberately design and permanently incorporate in the laws of the country a program to supplement the regular unemployment insurance program at any time in the future when unemployment nationally increases beyond the level for which the regular program should be responsible."

The principal advantage of such a program is clear. During times of high prosperity when comparatively few people are without jobs, the program would be inactive, but as soon as the Secretary of Labor finds that unemployment rates have passed a certain level for a reasonable period of time, then the standby program comes into operation and gives both the economy and the jobless worker a boost. The person who is out of work and has a family to support could immediately receive a check to help tide him over each week that he is seeking employment. He would not have to wait 3 months for Congress to convene and then about another 3 months for Congress, after committee deliberations and floor debate, to produce a law. Already 2 months of this session have gone by and there is as yet no action.

By citing the examples which took place in the 1958 recession and which are taking place now, I think I have demonstrated why a permanent program of standby benefits is needed. I should now like to call your attention to the carefully drawn provisions of S. 5, which deal with the length of time that extended benefits would be paid during a period of recession.

Extended benefits would be paid under the Prouty-Scott bill up to a maximum for each claimant of an amount equal to 50 percent of the total amount of regular benefits which were payable to him pursuant to the State Unemployment Compensation Law under which he last exhausted his rights, or 13 times the claimant's weekly benefit amount, whichever is greater. Let me illustrate by example how the bill would work.

If a State law entitled a claimant to \$40 a week for 28 weeks and the claimant exhausted his benefits, our bill would extend to him 14 additional weeks protection at the same rate of pay. If, however, a State law had a regular benefit period of less than 26 weeks and a worker exhausted his benefits, he would (under our Republican-sponsored high-level unemployment compensation bill) be entitled to 13 additional weeks at the normal compensation rate. This is true because S. 5 guarantees the individual (in case of recessions) 50 percent of what he was getting under State law or 13 weeks' protection whichever is greater.

This proposal gives much more help to unemployed men and women than the administration proposal. The administration bill calls for a maximum of 13 weeks and has a formula which makes it possible for the family in the worst economic fix to get the least amount of money. Let me show you what I mean.

The Kennedy bill, H.R. 4806, says that the duration of payments would be 50 percent of the duration of the benefits which were exhausted and in no event may exceed 13 weeks. What is a maximum in the Kennedy bill (13 weeks) is a minimum in the Prouty-Scott bill, S. 5.

Take the case of an individual who lives in one of the depressed areas. Jobs in his locale are hard to come by and he has been without work for many, many months. When he has been able to get employment it has usually been for a day or two at a time. This unlucky person wouldn't get much in the way of benefits under many State laws and when he exhausted his State benefits he would have to look to the Federal Government. What would the Kennedy bill do for him? Well, because of his sporadic work record in at least 15 to 20 States, he would be entitled to only the minimum period of benefits. This minimum could be as low as 10 weeks or perhaps lower. The individual exhausts his 10 weeks of State benefits and the Kennedy bill comes along and states that he is entitled to half of what he got under State law, or, in other words, 5 weeks more protection. Since 13 weeks is a minimum period in the Prouty-Scott bill, this same fellow who has been down on his luck would get the full 13 weeks of extended Federal benefits.

I think it would be a good idea now to see how the administration program would work in a progressive Commonwealth such as Pennsylvania, which provides 30 weeks of benefits to an individual who is unemployed. A recent release of the Ways and Means Committee indicates how little help the Kennedy bill provides for the unemployed worker in a progressive Commonwealth such as Pennsylvania. The committee release has this to say:

"In a case where a State has a duration of longer than 26 weeks, for example 30 weeks, the State is to be reimbursed for the number of weeks beyond 26 weeks (in this case, 4 weeks), and the unemployed worker would receive the remaining number of weeks up to 13 weeks, or 9 weeks in this case."

If a man in our Commonwealth is without work and exhausts his State benefits under the administration bill he would receive 9 weeks of Federal help. Under the Prouty-Scott bill, however, the same individual would be entitled to 15 weeks of supplementary benefits. Since the normal State benefit period is 30 weeks in Pennsylvania, a jobless breadwinner having exhausted his rights would be entitled to protection for half as long as the duration to which he was entitled under our statute. In other words, 15 weeks of benefits, 6 weeks longer than under the Kennedy administration bill.

Our proposal would encourage States to lengthen their periods of coverage. The better a State statute is, the more help the individual would get when his State benefits run out. I am afraid the same cannot be said of the administration proposal.

I was very pleased to learn that the Senate Finance Committee will hold hearings soon on unemployment compensation. If the committee reports the best bill possible, it will help materially in maintaining purchasing power within the local business community at the present time and in every future recession.

Of course, an unemployment compensation bill by and of itself will not end our present economic difficulties, but coupled with other measures it will lessen its duration and accelerate economic recovery. I urge my colleagues to examine S. 5 carefully. I think they will find it is one of the soundest and most humane items of legislation put forward at this session of Congress.

#### EDUCATION OF THE BLIND—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] may be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 361) to amend the act to promote the education of the blind, approved March 3, 1879, as amended, so as to authorize wider distribution of books and other special instruction materials for the blind, and to increase the appropriations authorized for this purpose, and to otherwise improve such act, which I introduced (for myself and Mr. COOPER) on January 11, 1961.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### CARE OF IWO JIMA MEMORIAL BY AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] may be added, as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 872) vesting in the American Battle Monuments Commission the care and maintenance of the original Iwo Jima Memorial on Mount Surabachi, Iwo Jima volcanic islands, Pacific Ocean area, which I introduced on February 9, 1961.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### PROVISION FOR NATIONAL PORTRAIT GALLERY AS A BUREAU OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION—ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL ARMED FORCES MUSEUM ADVISORY BOARD OF SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILLS

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], be added as a cosponsor to Senate bill 1057, "to provide for a National Portrait Gallery as a bureau of the Smithsonian Institution," and also to Senate bill 1058, "to establish a National Armed Forces Museum Advisory Board of the Smithsonian Institution, to authorize expansion of the Smithsonian Institution's facilities for portraying the contributions of the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes," at the next printing of these bills.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be discharged from further consideration of the bill (S. 1034), relating to certain inspections and investigations in metallic and nonmetallic mines (excluding coal and lignite mines) for the purpose of obtaining information relating